Applicant requests consideration and allowance of the subject application in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 32-54 are pending in the application, with claims 32, 38, 43, and 48 being independent. By this amendment, claims 32, 33, 38, 39, 43, 44, 48, and 49 have been amended, and claims 53 and 54 are newly added. Support for the amendments and newly added claims can be found in the application, as filed. Specifically, support for the claim amendments may be found at least at page 2, lines 8-12, support for new claim 53 can be found at least in Figures 5 and 6, and support for new claim 54 can be found at least at page 2, lines 8-12, and page 20, lines 16-20. No new matter is being added.

In the Office Action dated May 4, 2005, claims 32-52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,400,462 (Hille). Applicant traverses this rejection.

As now recited in independent claim 32, a printing system features a printer apparatus and an information processing apparatus. The information processing apparatus includes a display unit, a memory, identification means for identifying the notice sent by notice means, and control means. When the notice is identified as a first type of notice, the control means controls the display unit to perform a display based on information corresponding to the first type of notice, which is stored in the memory in advance. When the notice is identified as a second type of notice, for which corresponding countermeasure information is not stored locally, the control means controls the display unit to perform a request display for prompting an operator to instruct whether or not to connect to a first URL to obtain the countermeasure information

corresponding to the second type notice. The information processing apparatus is connected to the internet when the connection to the first URL is instructed, and a display based on the countermeasure information which is obtained via the internet based on the first URL is displayed on the display unit of the information processing apparatus.

In other aspects of Applicant's invention, claims 38, 43, and 48 recite, respectively, an information processing apparatus, an information processing method, and a computer program product for an information processing apparatus, all of which have features that generally relate to the above-described features of the information processing apparatus of claim 32.

Applicant submits that many features of the independent claims are not taught or suggested by Hille.

Hille relates to a service tool for servicing printers in which printer errors are detected, their cause is obtained, and fix information is provided. The errors and fix information are stored as HTML files. As recited at column 6, lines 52-54, "[t]he HTML files are stored locally on portable computer 11, but can be periodically updated from information stored on the internet."

However, Hille does not teach or suggest prompting an operator to instruct whether or not to connect to a first URL to obtain the countermeasure information corresponding to a second type of notice, for which corresponding countermeasure information is not stored locally, as recited in independent claims 32, 38, 43, and 48. Hille is completely silent regarding prompting an operator.

Hille also makes no mention of types of notices, and therefore is not understood to teach or suggest a first type of notice and a second type of notice for which corresponding countermeasure information is not stored locally, as recited in the independent claims. Moreover, because Hille does not teach or suggest types of notices, it also cannot be understood to teach or suggest performing different operations when different types of notices are given. Distinguishably, Applicant's invention, as set forth in the independent claims, features performing a display based on information corresponding to the first type of notice when a first type of notice is identified, and performing a request display for prompting an operator to instruct whether or not to connect to a first URL to obtain countermeasure information when a second type of notice is identified.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submit that Hille fails to teach or suggest features of independent claims 32, 28, 43, and 48. Such features would also not be obvious in light of Hille. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the independent claims are requested.

The remaining claims depend from one of the independent claims, and are believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependency, and for reciting other patentable features of the invention. Favorable and independent reconsideration of the dependent claims are requested.

Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and an early Notice of Allowability are requested.

12

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C.

office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our

below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Didas
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 55,112

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
MJD:eyw:ayr

DC_MAIN 210348v1